

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,490	11/13/2003	Anne Dussaud	J6866(C)	8338
201 LINII EVER PA	7590 10/21/200 ATENT GROUP	EXAMINER		
800 SYLVAN AVENUE AG West S. Wing ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100			HOEKSTRA, JEFFREY GERBEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3736	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentgroupus@unilever.com

Advisory Action After the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10.0010.100		
10/712,490	DUSSAUD ET A	AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
IEEEDEV O LIGEVOTEA	0700	
JEFFREY G. HOEKSTRA	3736	I

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The reply	filed <u>07 October 2009</u> is acknowledged.	
	reply filed on or after the date of filing of an appeal eals and Interferences, will <u>not</u> be entered because	brief, but prior to a final decision by the Board of Patent
ā		ms (where the cancellation does not affect the scope of ent claims into independent form (no limitation of a that claim). See 37 CFR 41.33(b) and (c).
t	 The affidavit or other evidence is not timely file See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(2). 	d before the filing of an appeal brief.
		the two month time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.39(b), ensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not available.
	includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.39(a response to a remand by the Board of Patent Appe	to one of the following: (a) an examiner's answer that a)(2)); (b) a supplemental examiner's answer written in als and Interferences for further consideration of rejection bals and Interferences decision that includes a new ground o
3. 🛛 The	reply is entered. An explanation of the status of the	claims after entry is below or attached.
4. 🛭 Othe	er: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	
/Max Hin Supervisor	denburg/ y Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736	/Jeffrey G Hockstra/ Examiner, Art Unit 3736

PTOL-304 (Rev. 7-05) Advisory Action

Application No. 10/712.490

Continuation of 4 Other:

The status of the claims is as follows: claims 1-11 and 17-20 remain rejected as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed 07/08/2009, as reiterated hereinbelow.

Claim rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-11 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

- 3. Independent claims 1 and 5 positively recite in part "means for generating an acoustic emission signal from a body by contacting skin on one area of the body with skin on another area of the body to produce skin/skin frictional forces... wherein the acoustic emission signal is emitted when skin on one area of the body slides or rubs skin on another are of the body without motorized support".
- 4. The claimed invention requires a proper interpretation of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The means-plus-function limitation above interpreted consistent with the instant specification (see page 10 paragraphs 1 and 2) comprises at least the followino:
- a. "The inventive method uses acoustic signals emitted generated from contact with a substrate, preferably skin, when the skin on one area of the human

body slides on the skin on another area of the body, i.e., skin on skin. The frictional forces in the skin/skin contact generate vibration patterns that are sensed by probe(s) 12 placed near the skin/skin contact area and recorded by result storage, manipulation, and output system 18... Acoustic emission is recorded during the gentle rub of the hand or finger on another skin part. It is typically detected on the forearm, the hand or the face, but could also be used for other body parts." 6. The scope of the claimed invention positively recites naturally occurring phenomenon as structural limitance comprising portions of a human body (i.e. at least "skin on one area of the body", "skin on another area of the body", and "skin/skin frictional forces"). Claiming portions of the human body, including for example the skin of a hand, a finger, or a forearm, as structural limitations comprises onn-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 8. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Non-Patent Literature submission: Abstracts of a presentation at a skin conference in Hamburg, 2003, specifically Flament et al. ("Finger perception metrology. Correlation between friction force and acoustic emission"), hereinafter Flament.
- 9. For claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 17-20, Flament discloses a tactile acoustic emission measurement and analysis apparatus (Flament, pages 168-169), comprising inter alia:
- o means of generating an acoustic emission signal from a body (Flament, pages 168-169)
- o means for collecting, storing, and displaying said emission signal (Flament, pages 168-169); and
- o means for correlating said emission signal with an attribute of skin of frictional forces comprising a means for evaluating current appearance of skin attributes (Flament, pages 168-169).
- o wherein said apparatus is used as a clinical evaluation tool of skin attributes
- (Flament, pages 168-169),
- o wherein said apparatus is intended to be used by consumers or clinicians (e.g. a beautician or professional advisor, Flament, pages 168-169) to study/evaluate the impact the effect of the application cosmetic compositions that affect skin attributes, including: hydration, texture, roughness, porosity, wrinkles, and pathologies of cutaneous tissue (psoriasis, eczema, dry skin, etc...) (Flament, pages 168-169).
- o wherein said system comprises a medium for indicia of at least said two said skin attributes (i.e. test results) that allows said clinician to distinguish the effect of said application of cosmetic composition (Flament et al, pages 168-169), o wherein the system is capable of being placed alongside a container holding said cosmetic composition and facilitating cosmetic composition selection based on the determined skin attributes, owherein said system is used in air (Flament et al, pages 168-169).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flament in view of Fleming (Non-Patent Literature submission: Abstracts of a presentation at a skin conference in Hamburg, 2003, Fleming "Mobile, multimedia computing for improved clinicopathologic correlation in dermatopathology".
- 12. Flament discloses the claimed invention, as set forth and cited above, except for expressly disclosing a means for digitally displaying test result signals via the internet and/or handheld software. Fleming teaches means for digitally displaying test result signals via the internet and/or handheld software (Fleming, pages 170-171). All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. All of the component parts are known in Flament and Fleming. The only difference is the combination of the component parts into a single device. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the components as taught by Flament with the components as taught by Fleming to achieve the predictable results of providing an alternate means to display diagnostic days diagnostic days.